

Semi-Supervised Learning via Sparse Label Propagation

Alexander Jung

FIRST.LAST@AALTO.FI

*Department of Computer Science
Aalto University
Espoo, FI*

Alfred O. Hero III

LAST@EECS.UMICH.EDU

*Department of EE and CS
The University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, MI*

Alexandru Mara

FIRST.LAST@AALTO.FI

*Department of Computer Science
Aalto University
Espoo, FI*

Saeed Jahromi

FIRST.LAST@AALTO.FI

*Department of Computer Science
Aalto University
Espoo, FI*

Editor: TBD

Abstract

This work proposes a novel method for semi-supervised learning from partially labeled massive network-structured datasets, i.e., big data over networks. We model the underlying hypothesis, which relates data points to labels, as a graph signal, defined over some graph (network) structure intrinsic to the dataset. Following the key principle of supervised learning, i.e., “similar inputs yield similar outputs”, we require the graph signals induced by labels to have small total variation. Accordingly, we formulate the problem of learning the labels of data points as a non-smooth convex optimization problem which amounts to balancing between the empirical loss, i.e., the discrepancy with some partially available label information, and the smoothness quantified by the total variation of the learned graph signal. We solve this optimization problem by appealing to a recently proposed preconditioned variant of the popular primal-dual method by Pock and Chambolle, which results in a sparse label propagation algorithm. This learning algorithm allows for a highly scalable implementation as message passing over the underlying data graph. By applying concepts of compressed sensing to the learning problem, we are also able to provide a transparent sufficient condition on the underlying network structure such that accurate learning of the labels is possible. We also present an implementation of the message passing formulation allows for a highly scalable implementation in big data frameworks.

Keywords: semi-supervised learning, convex optimization, total variation, complex networks

1. Introduction

A variety of modern technological systems generate (heterogeneous) data at unprecedented scale, i.e., “Big Data” (Mayika et al., 2011; Donoho, 2000; White, 2009; Cui et al., 2016). While lacking a precise formal definition, many Big Data problems share four main characteristics: (i) large data volume, (ii) high speed of data generation, (iii) heterogeneous data, i.e., partially labeled, mixture of audio, video and text data and (iv) noisy data, i.e., there are statistical variations due to missing labels, labelling errors, or poor data curation (White, 2009). Moreover, in a wide range of big data applications, e.g., social networks, sensor networks, communication networks, and biological networks, an intrinsic graph (or network) structure is present. This graph structure reflects either the physical properties of a system (e.g., public transportation networks) or statistical dependencies (e.g., probabilistic graphical models for bioinformatics). Quite often, these two notions of graph structure coincide: in a wireless sensor network, the graph modelling the communication links between nodes and the graph formed by statistical dependencies between sensor measurements resemble each other since both graphs are induced by the mutual proximity of the nodes (Wiesel and Hero, 2012; Moldaschl et al., 2014; Quan et al., 2009).

On the algorithmic side, having a graph model for the observed data points facilitates scalable distributed data processing in the form of message passing on the graph. At a higher level, graph models are suitable for heterogeneous datasets containing data points of diverse nature, since they only require a weak notion of similarity between data points. Moreover, this notion of similarity enables the graph models to capitalize on massive amounts of unlabeled data via semi-supervised learning (Chapelle et al., 2006). In particular, semi-supervised learning exploits the information contained in large amounts of unlabeled data points by considering their similarities to a small number of labeled data points.

In this paper, we consider the problem of (transductive) semi-supervised learning using a known graph model for the raw data. This graph or network model, referred to as the data graph in what follows, contains individual data points as its nodes. Two nodes of the data graph which represent similar data points are connected by an edge. The data graph typically contains a small number of data points for which label information is available. However, since acquiring label information is typically expensive, typically the majority of data points in the data graph are unlabeled. The goal of semi-supervised learning is then to learn the labels of those unlabeled data points by exploiting the label dependency information reflected by the topology of the data graph and the available label information for few data points. We tackle this learning problem by casting the dataset as a graph signal. In this graph signal model, the (unknown) labels of the data points are identified as the signal values of a graph signal whose domain is the node set of the data graph. The graph signal is then required to be nearly constant over well-connected subset of nodes (clusters).

Representing the labels of data points as a smooth graph signal is in line with the informal smoothness assumption underlying many supervised learning methods (Chapelle et al., 2006), i.e., similar data points should have similar labels. In other words, the graph signal representing the underlying labeling is expected to reflect the topology of the underlying data graph, i.e., labels of closely connected nodes are highly correlated and thus these signals form close-knit clusters or communities (Fortunato, 2009). There are different options

for quantifying the smoothness of a graph signal. A prominent line of work uses the graph Laplacian quadratic form of a graph signal as smoothness measure. In particular, the idea behind some well-known label propagation (LP) methods (Zhu and Ghahramani, 2002; Chapelle et al., 2006) is to minimize this quadratic form while also enforcing consistency with the initial label information provided for a small number of data points. In contrast, the approach proposed in this paper is based on using the total variation (Shuman et al., 2013) of a graph signal, which models clustered graph signals more accurately compared to the Laplacian quadratic form (Chapelle et al., 2006). Indeed, using TV as a smoothness measure allows the graph signal to change significantly on boundaries between clusters, as long as the number of boundary nodes is small compared to non-boundary nodes.

1.1 Existing Work

The problem of semi-supervised learning based on graph models is discussed in-depth in (Chapelle et al., 2006), which also includes the popular LP method. Due to its simplicity and scalability, many variations of LP have been proposed. Underlying LP and its variants is the smoothness measured called the graph Laplacian quadratic form. In this proposed framework, LP can be interpreted as solving a system of linear equations obtained from the optimality condition for minimizing a quadratic function (Chen et al., 2014, 2015a,b). In contrast, in this paper we will use total variation for quantifying the smoothness of a graph signal. This still results in solving a convex optimization problem, however with optimality conditions that lead to non-linear equations. Related previous approaches are the works (Sharpnack et al., 2012; Wang et al., 2016; Hallac et al., 2015) for general graph models, as well as a prominent line of work on total variation-based image processing (Chambolle, 2004; Chambolle and Pock, 2016; Pock and Chambolle, 2011). What sets our work apart from (Chambolle, 2004; Chambolle and Pock, 2016; Pock and Chambolle, 2011), which consider only grid graphs, is that we allow for general graph topology as in (Sharpnack et al., 2012; Wang et al., 2016; Hallac et al., 2015). However, in contrast to (Sharpnack et al., 2012; Wang et al., 2016), the partial label information represented by graph signal values, is available only on a small subset of nodes. The proposed learning algorithm is closely related to the network Lasso (Hallac et al., 2015), as will be discussed in Section 2.

1.2 Contributions and Outline

In Section 2, we formulate (transductive) semi-supervised learning over graph-based models as a convex optimization problem. By applying a preconditioned variant of the popular primal-dual method of Pock and Chambolle to this problem, we obtain a sparse LP algorithm in Section 3. We then formulate this learning algorithm as message passing, requiring only local computations over the data graph and making it perfectly scalable to massive datasets (big data). In Section 4, we present a sufficient condition on the available partial label information and data graph topology such that accurate learning is guaranteed by sparse LP. We also discuss how to implement sparse LP in a state-of-the-art big data framework. In order to verify the accuracy and scalability of the proposed learning algorithm, we conducted numerical experiments, with the obtained results reported in Section 5.

1.3 Notation

Given a vector $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)^T \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we define the norms $\|\mathbf{x}\|_1 := \sum_{l=1}^n |x_l|$ and $\|\mathbf{x}\|_2 := \sqrt{\sum_{l=1}^n (x_l)^2}$, respectively. The spectral norm of a matrix \mathbf{D} is denoted $\|\mathbf{D}\|_2 := \sup_{\|\mathbf{x}\|_2=1} \|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{x}\|_2$. For a positive semidefinite (psd) matrix \mathbf{Q} , with spectral decomposition $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{U} \text{diag}\{q_i\}_{i=1}^n \mathbf{U}^T$, we define its square root as $\mathbf{Q}^{1/2} := \mathbf{U} \text{diag}\{\sqrt{q_i}\}_{i=1}^n \mathbf{U}^T$. For a convex function $g(\mathbf{x})$, we denote its subdifferential at the point $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ by

$$\partial g(\mathbf{x}_0) := \{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n : g(\mathbf{x}) \geq g(\mathbf{x}_0) + \mathbf{y}^T(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0) \text{ for any } \mathbf{x}\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n.$$

2. The Semi-Supervised Learning Problem

We consider a heterogeneous dataset $\mathcal{D} = \{z_i\}_{i=1}^N \subseteq \mathcal{Z}$ consisting of N data points $z_i \in \mathcal{Z}$, which might be of significantly different nature, e.g., the data point $z_1 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a d -dimensional feature vector, data point z_2 is a continuous-time signal (i.e., $z_2 : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$) and another data point z_3 might represent the bag-of-words histogram of a text document. Thus, we assume the input space \mathcal{Z} is rich enough to accommodate strongly heterogeneous data. Associated with the dataset \mathcal{D} is an undirected weighted graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, \mathbf{W})$, referred to as the data graph, with node set $\mathcal{V} = \{1, \dots, N\}$, edge set $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$, and symmetric weight matrix $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$. The nodes represent the data points, i.e., each node $i \in \mathcal{V}$ corresponds to a unique datapoint $z_i \in \mathcal{D}$. An undirected edge $\{i, j\} \in \mathcal{E}$ encodes some notion of (physical or statistical) proximity of neighboring data points z_i and z_j . Given an edge $\{i, j\} \in \mathcal{E}$, the nonzero value $W_{i,j} > 0$ represents the strength of the connection $\{i, j\} \in \mathcal{E}$. The edge set \mathcal{E} can be read off from the non-zero pattern of the weight matrix $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ since

$$\{i, j\} \in \mathcal{E} \text{ if and only if } W_{i,j} > 0. \quad (1)$$

We assume the data graph \mathcal{G} to be simple, i.e., it contains no self-loops, so that $W_{i,i} = 0$ for all $i \in \mathcal{V}$.

The neighbourhood $\mathcal{N}(i)$ and weighted degree (strength) d_i of node $i \in \mathcal{V}$ are defined, respectively, as (Newman, 2010)

$$\mathcal{N}(i) := \{j \in \mathcal{V} : \{i, j\} \in \mathcal{E}\}, \text{ and } d_i := \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)} W_{i,j}. \quad (2)$$

The (degree) distribution of the values $\{d_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{V}}$ is of paramount relevance for the characterization and behaviour of (processes over) complex networks (Newman, 2010). One key parameter of this distribution is the maximum strength of similarity over a neighborhood

$$d_{\max} := \max_{i \in \mathcal{V}} d_i \stackrel{(2)}{=} \max_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)} W_{i,j}. \quad (3)$$

Starting with an undirected data graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, \mathbf{W})$, we define its directed version $\vec{\mathcal{G}} = (\mathcal{V}, \vec{\mathcal{E}}, \mathbf{W})$, by introducing edge orientations, giving each edge a direction with a head (origin node) and tail (destination node) denoted e^+ and e^- , respectively. Given a set of edges $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{E}$ in the undirected graph \mathcal{G} , we denote the corresponding set of directed edges in




Figure 1: Different types of datasets represented by graph signals defined over (a) a chain graph (discrete time signals), (b) grid graph (2D-images) and (c) a general graph (two cliques connected by a single edge).

$\vec{\mathcal{G}}$ as $\vec{\mathcal{S}}$. For a directed graph $\vec{\mathcal{G}}$, we define the *incidence matrix* $\mathbf{D} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{E}| \times |\mathcal{V}|}$ (Sharpnack et al., 2012)

$$D_{e,i} = \begin{cases} W_e & \text{if } i = e^+ \\ -W_e & \text{if } i = e^- \\ 0 & \text{else.} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

Moreover, we define the oriented neighbourhoods of a node $i \in \mathcal{V}$ as $\mathcal{N}_+(i) := \{j \in \mathcal{V} : e = \{i, j\} \in \mathcal{E}, \text{ and } e^+ = i\}$ and $\mathcal{N}_-(i) := \{j \in \mathcal{V} : e = \{i, j\} \in \mathcal{E}, \text{ and } e^- = i\}$. If we number the nodes and orient the edges in the chain graph in Fig. 1-(a) from left to right, its weighted incidence matrix would be

$$\mathbf{D} = \begin{pmatrix} W_{1,2} & -W_{1,2} & 0 \\ 0 & W_{2,3} & -W_{2,3} \end{pmatrix}.$$

In many machine learning applications, we assign to each data point $z_i \in \mathcal{D}$ an associated label $x_i \in \mathbb{R}$, which we denote as an output value.¹ Consider, e.g., a dataset obtained from social network user profiles where each data point z_i is constituted by all profile features. Here, the label x_i might represent the preference of user z_i to buy a certain product.

We will represent the (mostly unknown) labels x_i for the data points $z_i \in \mathcal{D}$ conveniently as a graph signal $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{V}}$ defined over the data graph \mathcal{G} . For a given data point $z_i \in \mathcal{V}$,

1. We highlight that the term “label” is typically reserved for discrete-valued or categorical output variables x_i (Bishop, 2006). Since we can always represent the values of categorical output variables by real numbers, we will formulate our learning method for real-valued output variables $x_i \in \mathbb{R}$. In particular, the learning method summarized in Algorithm 1, which is based on minimizing the total variation of real-valued labels, can also be used for classification by suitably quantizing the predicted output values. Extensions to other loss functions, more suitable to characterize the empirical error for discrete-valued or categorical labels, will be a focus of future work.

represent by node $i \in \mathcal{V}$ in the data graph, the graph signal value $x[i]$ is given by the label x_i associated with z_i . In what follows, we assume that for a small subset $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{D}$ of data points, which we refer to as the sampling set, we are provided initial labels $\{x_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{M}}$. With a slight abuse of notation, we will refer by \mathcal{M} also to the subset of nodes $i \in \mathcal{V}$ representing labelled data points $z_i \in \mathcal{M}$. In applications where acquiring labels is costly, we would like to keep the sampling set as small as possible, i.e., we are mainly interested in the regime where $|\mathcal{M}| \ll N$.

In order to learn the labels $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{V}}$ from a limited number of initial labels $\{x_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{M}}$, we rely on an informal smoothness assumption behind many (semi-) supervised learning methods (Chapelle et al., 2006):

Informal Smoothness Assumption. *Consider a graph signal $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{V}}$ whose signal values are the (unknown) labels x_i of the data points $z_i \in \mathcal{D}$. The signal values $x[i]$, $x[j]$ at nodes $i, j \in \mathcal{V}$ within a well-connected subset of nodes in the data graph are similar, i.e., $x[i] \approx x[j]$ with respect to some metric on the label space \mathbb{R} .*

In order to make this informal smoothness assumption precise, we propose to measure the smoothness of a graph signal $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{V}}$ via its total variation (TV)

$$\|\mathbf{x}\|_{\text{TV}} := \sum_{\{i,j\} \in \mathcal{E}} W_{i,j} |x[j] - x[i]|. \quad (5)$$

The use of (variants of) TV is prevalent in network clustering and image processing (Sharpnack et al., 2012; Wang et al., 2016; Hallac et al., 2015). A generalization of the TV for vector-valued graph signals is minimized in (Hallac et al., 2015) in order to learn improved classifiers (e.g., support vector machines). For the particular grid graph structure underlying image data, many efficient denoising techniques are based on minimizing TV (Chambolle and Pock, 2016, 2011).

Some well-known examples of smooth graph signals are low-pass signals in digital signal processing where time samples at adjacent time instants are strongly correlated for sufficiently high sampling rate (cf. Fig. 1-(a)). Another example are 2D signals (modelled as grid graphs) representing natural images where close-by pixels tend to be coloured similarly (cf. Fig. 1-(b)).

Let us now introduce a very simple but useful model for smooth graph signals $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{V}}$ having small TV $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{\text{TV}}$. In particular, consider graph signals of the form

$$x[i] = \sum_{l=1}^{|\mathcal{F}|} a_l \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{C}_l}[i] \quad \text{with } \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{C}_l}[i] := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } i \in \mathcal{C}_l \\ 0 & \text{else.} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

Here, we used a fixed partition $\mathcal{F} = \{\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_{|\mathcal{F}|}\}$ of the entire data graph \mathcal{G} into disjoint clusters $\mathcal{C}_l \subseteq \mathcal{V}$. The boundary $\partial\mathcal{F}$ of a partition \mathcal{F} is constituted by all edges connecting nodes from different clusters, i.e.,

$$\partial\mathcal{F} := \{\{i, j\} \in \mathcal{E} \text{ with } i \in \mathcal{C}_a \text{ and } j \in \mathcal{C}_b \neq \mathcal{C}_a\}. \quad (7)$$

We can bound the TV of a clustered graph signal of the form (6), as can be verified easily, by

$$\|\mathbf{x}\|_{\text{TV}} = 2 \max_{l \in \{1, \dots, |\mathcal{F}|\}} |a_l| \sum_{\{i,j\} \in \partial\mathcal{F}} W_{i,j}. \quad (8)$$

While there is now unique formal definition of when to call a subset of nodes a “cluster”, we typically refer by a cluster to a subset of nodes which is weakly connected to nodes outside the cluster (Fortunato, 2009). For weakly interconnected clusters \mathcal{C}_l , the partition $\mathcal{F} = \{\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_{|\mathcal{F}|}\}$ has a small boundary $\partial\mathcal{F}$ such that graph signals clustered according to \mathcal{F} (cf. (6)) have small TV due to (8).

The signal model (6), which also has been studied in (Sharpnack et al., 2012; Wang et al., 2016), is closely related to the stochastic block model (SBM) (Mossel et al., 2012). Indeed, the SBM corresponds to graph signals of the form (6) with coefficients a_l being unique for each cluster \mathcal{C}_l , i.e., $a_l \neq a_{l'}$ for $\mathcal{C}_l \neq \mathcal{C}_{l'}$. Moreover, the SBM provides a generative (stochastic) model for the edges within and between the clusters \mathcal{C}_l .

The incidence matrix \mathbf{D} (cf. (4)) of the oriented data graph $\vec{\mathcal{G}}$ allows us to represent $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{\text{TV}}$ by

$$\|\mathbf{x}\|_{\text{TV}} = \|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{x}\|_1. \quad (9)$$

We learn the labels $\hat{x}[i]$ for the entire dataset $\mathcal{D} = \{z_i\}_{i=1}^N$ via minimizing $\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}\|_{\text{TV}}$ among all labellings $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{R}^V$ which are consistent with the initial labels $\{x_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{M}}$, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbf{x}} \in \arg \min_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{R}^V} \sum_{\{i,j\} \in \mathcal{E}} W_{i,j} |\tilde{x}[j] - \tilde{x}[i]| \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \tilde{x}[i] = x[i] \text{ for all } i \in \mathcal{M} \\ \stackrel{(9)}{=} \arg \min_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{R}^V} \|\mathbf{D}\tilde{\mathbf{x}}\|_1 \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \tilde{x}[i] = x[i] \text{ for all } i \in \mathcal{M}. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

The objective function of the optimization problem (10) is the seminorm $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{\text{TV}}$, which is a convex function.² Since moreover the constraints in (10) are linear, the optimization problem (10) is a convex optimization problem (Boyd and Vandenberghe, 2004). Moreover, as the notation in (10) suggests, there typically exist several solutions to this optimization problem. The optimization method we will use for solving (10) does not require uniqueness of the solution, i.e., it can be applied even if there are several different optimal labellings $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$. Any labelling $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ which solves (10) is characterized by two properties: (i) it is consistent with the initial labels, i.e., $\hat{x}[i] = x_i$ for all $i \in \mathcal{M}$; and (ii) it has minimum TV among all such labelings.

Learning methods based on solving (10) will be called sparse LP (SLP) methods, due to the similarity of (10) and the optimization problem underlying ordinary LP (Chapelle et al., 2006, Chap 11.3.4.):

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\text{LP}} \in \arg \min_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{R}^V} \sum_{\{i,j\} \in \mathcal{E}} W_{i,j} (\tilde{x}[i] - \tilde{x}[j])^2 \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \tilde{x}[i] = x_i \text{ for all } i \in \mathcal{M}. \quad (11)$$

We highlight the fact that problem (11) amounts to minimizing the squared ℓ_2 norm, while the SLP problem (10) aims to minimize the ℓ_1 norm of the weighted graph signal differences $x[i] - x[j]$ over all edges $\{i, j\} \in \mathcal{E}$ in the data graph \mathcal{G} . The use of different norms results in significantly different behaviour of LP (aiming at solving (11)) compared to the proposed SLP (aiming at solving (10)). In particular, since SLP is based on the ℓ_1 norm of signal

2. The seminorm $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{\text{TV}}$ is convex since it is homogeneous ($\|\alpha\mathbf{x}\|_{\text{TV}} = |\alpha|\|\mathbf{x}\|_{\text{TV}}$ for $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$) and satisfies the triangle inequality ($\|\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \|\mathbf{x}\|_{\text{TV}} + \|\mathbf{y}\|_{\text{TV}}$). These two properties imply convexity (Boyd and Vandenberghe, 2004, Section 3.1.5).

differences, it is able to accurately learn graph signals which might vary abruptly over few edges, e.g., piecewise constant discrete time signals. In contrast, LP tends to smooth out such abrupt signal variations (cf. Section 5).

The SLP problem (10) is closely related to the recently proposed network Lasso (Hallac et al., 2015; Jung, 2017)

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\text{nLasso}} \in \arg \min_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{V}}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{M}} (\tilde{x}[i] - x_i)^2 + \lambda \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}\|_{\text{TV}}. \quad (12)$$

The tuning parameter λ trades small empirical label fitting error $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{M}} (\tilde{x}[i] - x_i)^2$ against smoothness $\|\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\text{nLasso}}\|_{\text{TV}}$ of the learned graph signal $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\text{nLasso}}$. Choosing a large value of λ enforces smoothness of the learned graph signal, while using a small value for λ puts more emphasis on the empirical error. In particular, as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ the solutions of the network Lasso problem (12) become more similar to the solutions of the SLP problem (10).

Now that we have formulated the (transductive) semi-supervised learning problem as the (nonsmooth) convex optimization problem (10), we can apply efficient convex optimization methods to obtain learning algorithms. However, it is important to note that the formulation (10) requires knowledge of the data graph \mathcal{G} . In particular, the objective function $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{\text{TV}} = \|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{x}\|_1$ depends on the graph structure via the incidence matrix \mathbf{D} (cf. (4)). Many applications naturally specify the data graph structure, e.g., proximal dependency in chain graphs of autoregressive time series models or grid graphs of Markov random fields for image processing. However, in some applications the underlying graph model has to be learned from the data, e.g., using probabilistic graphical models (Jung, 2015; Jung et al., 2015; Jung et al., 2014). In this paper, we assume the data graph \mathcal{G} is specified.

For a dataset \mathcal{D} whose data graph \mathcal{G} contains several isolated components (Newman, 2010) that are not connected with each other, the learning problem (10) decomposes into independent subproblems, i.e., one instance of (10) for each of the components. Therefore, without loss of generality, in the sequel we consider datasets whose data graph \mathcal{G} is connected.

3. Sparse Label Propagation for Semi-Supervised Learning

The learning problem (10) is a non-smooth convex optimization problem, which precludes the use of standard gradient methods such as (accelerated) gradient descent. However, the objective function and the constraint set have simple structure when considered independently from each other. This structure suggests the use of efficient proximal methods (Parikh and Boyd, 2013) for solving (10). In particular, we apply a preconditioned variant of the primal-dual method introduced by (Chambolle and Pock, 2011) to solve (10).

In order to apply the primal-dual method of (Chambolle and Pock, 2011), we have to reformulate (10) as an equivalent unconstrained convex optimization problem

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}} \in \arg \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{V}}} f(\mathbf{x}) := g(\mathbf{D}\mathbf{x}) + h(\mathbf{x}), \text{ with } g(\mathbf{y}) := \|\mathbf{y}\|_1 \text{ and } h(\mathbf{x}) := \delta_{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathbf{x}). \quad (13)$$

Here, the indicator function $\delta_{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathbf{x})$ of a convex set \mathcal{Q} is defined as

$$\delta_{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} \infty & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \notin \mathcal{Q} \\ 0 & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{Q} \end{cases}, \quad (14)$$

or, equivalently, via its epigraph

$$\text{epi}\delta_{\mathcal{Q}} := \{(\mathbf{x}, t) : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{Q}, t \in \mathbb{R}_+\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{V}} \times \mathbb{R}.$$

The solutions $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ of (13) are characterized by the zero-subgradient condition

$$\mathbf{0} \in \partial f(\hat{\mathbf{x}}). \quad (15)$$

A proximal method is obtained by applying fixed-point iterations for some operator \mathcal{P} such that $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ are the fixed-points of \mathcal{P} , i.e.,

$$\mathbf{0} \in \partial f(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) \text{ if and only if } \hat{\mathbf{x}} = \mathcal{P}\hat{\mathbf{x}}. \quad (16)$$

The operator \mathcal{P} depends on the objective function $f(\mathbf{x})$ but is not uniquely defined, i.e., there are different choices for \mathcal{P} such that (16) will define solutions of (13).

One extremely powerful approach to choosing the operator \mathcal{P} in (16), which underlies many primal-dual optimization methods (Chambolle and Pock, 2011; Pock and Chambolle, 2011), is based on convex duality (Rockafellar, 1970). In particular, according to (Rockafellar, 1970, Thm. 31.3), a graph signal $\hat{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{V}}$ is solution to the problem (13) if and only if there exists a (dual vector) $\hat{\mathbf{y}} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{E}}$ such that

$$\mathbf{D}\hat{\mathbf{x}} \in \partial g^*(\hat{\mathbf{y}}), \text{ and } -(\mathbf{D}^T \hat{\mathbf{y}}) \in \partial h(\hat{\mathbf{x}}). \quad (17)$$

Here, $g^*(\hat{\mathbf{y}})$ denotes the convex conjugate of the convex function $g(\mathbf{y})$, which is defined as (Boyd and Vandenberghe, 2004)

$$g^*(\hat{\mathbf{y}}) := \sup_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{E}}} \mathbf{y}^T \hat{\mathbf{y}} - g(\mathbf{y}). \quad (18)$$

The dual vector $\hat{\mathbf{y}} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{E}}$ represents a signal defined over the edges \mathcal{E} in the data graph \mathcal{G} , with the entry $\hat{y}[e]$ being the signal value associated with the particular edge $e \in \mathcal{E}$. The two coupled conditions in (17) can be rewritten, rather trivially, as

$$2\mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{D}\hat{\mathbf{x}} + \hat{\mathbf{y}} \in \mathbf{\Lambda}\partial g^*(\hat{\mathbf{y}}) + \mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{D}\hat{\mathbf{x}} + \hat{\mathbf{y}}, \text{ and } \hat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{\Gamma}\mathbf{D}^T \hat{\mathbf{y}} \in \hat{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{\Gamma}\partial h(\hat{\mathbf{x}}), \quad (19)$$

with the invertible diagonal matrices

$$\mathbf{\Lambda} := \text{diag}\{\lambda_{\{i,j\}} := 1/(2W_{i,j})\}_{\{i,j\} \in \mathcal{E}} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E}} \text{ and } \mathbf{\Gamma} := \text{diag}\{\gamma_i := 1/d_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}}. \quad (20)$$

Since the resolvent operators $(\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{\Gamma}\partial h)^{-1}$ and $(\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{\Lambda}\partial g^*)^{-1}$ are well-defined for the particular choices of $g(\mathbf{y})$ and $h(\mathbf{x})$ in (13) (cf. (Parikh and Boyd, 2013)), the condition (19) for $\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\mathbf{y}}$ to be primal and dual optimal is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbf{x}} &= (\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{\Gamma}\partial h)^{-1}(\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{\Gamma}\mathbf{D}^T \hat{\mathbf{y}}) \\ \hat{\mathbf{y}} - 2(\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{\Lambda}\partial g^*)^{-1}\mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{D}\hat{\mathbf{x}} &= (\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{\Lambda}\partial g^*)^{-1}(\hat{\mathbf{y}} - \mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{D}\hat{\mathbf{x}}) \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

The characterization (21) for $\hat{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{V}}$ to be a solution to (10) lends naturally to the following fixed-point iterations for finding $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ (cf. (Pock and Chambolle, 2011))

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(k+1)} &:= (\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{\Gamma}\partial h)^{-1}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(k)} - \mathbf{\Gamma}\mathbf{D}^T \hat{\mathbf{y}}^{(k)}) \\ \hat{\mathbf{y}}^{(k+1)} &:= (\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{\Lambda}\partial g^*)^{-1}(\hat{\mathbf{y}}^{(k)} + \mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{D}(2\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(k+1)} - \hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(k)})). \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

The specific choice (20) for the scaling matrices $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ and $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ in (22) can be shown to satisfy

$$\|\mathbf{\Gamma}^{1/2}\mathbf{D}^T\mathbf{\Lambda}^{1/2}\|_2 < 1, \quad (23)$$

which guarantees, in turn, convergence of the iterations (22) (cf. (Pock and Chambolle, 2011)).

The fixed-point iterations (22) are similar to those considered in (Chambolle and Pock, 2011, Sec. 6.2.). In particular, the iterations (22) involve the resolvent operators (Pock and Chambolle, 2011, Sec. 1.1.)

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{\Gamma}\partial h)^{-1}(\mathbf{x}) &= \arg \min_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{V}}} h(\mathbf{z}) + (1/2)(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z})^T \mathbf{\Gamma}^{-1}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}), \text{ and} \\ (\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{\Lambda}\partial g)^{-1}(\mathbf{y}) &= \arg \min_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{E}}} g(\mathbf{z}) + (1/2)(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{z})^T \mathbf{\Lambda}^{-1}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{z}). \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Based on (24), closely following the arguments used in (Chambolle and Pock, 2011, Sec. 6.2.), we obtain simple closed-form expressions for the updates in (22) yielding, in turn, Algorithm 1.

There are various options for the stopping criterion in Algorithm 1, e.g., using a fixed number of iterations or testing for sufficient decrease of the objective function (cf. (Becker et al., 2011)). When using a fixed number of iterations, it is helpful to have a characterization of the convergence rate of Algorithm 1. Such a characterization can be obtained from (Pock and Chambolle, 2011, Lemma 2), which yields the following upper bound on the sub-optimality in terms of the TV $\|\hat{\mathbf{x}}\|_{\text{TV}}$ (cf. (10)) achieved by the output $\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(k)}$ after k iterations of Algorithm 1 :

$$\|\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(k)}\|_{\text{TV}} - \|\hat{\mathbf{x}}\|_{\text{TV}} \leq c_1/k. \quad (25)$$

The constant c_1 may depend on the underlying graph signal \mathbf{x} . We highlight that this convergence rate, i.e., $\propto 1/k$ with k being the number of iterations, is optimal for first-order gradient methods, i.e., which only have access to the (sub-)gradient of the objective function in each iteration, applied to problems of the type (10) (cf. (Juditsky and Nemirovski, 2011)). Let us highlight that the SLP Algorithm 1 only requires the data graph but it does not require knowledge of the partition \mathcal{F} underlying the clustered signal model (6). Rather, the partition \mathcal{F} and corresponding signal model (6) is only used for the performance analysis of Algorithm 1.

Below we present an implementation of Algorithm 1 as message passing over the underlying data graph \mathcal{G} . This message passing implementation, summarized in Algorithm 2, is obtained by implementing the application of the graph incidence matrix \mathbf{D} and its transpose \mathbf{D}^T (cf. steps 2 and 5 of Algorithm 1) by local updates of the labels $\hat{x}[i]$, i.e., updates which involve only the neighbourhoods $\mathcal{N}(i)$, $\mathcal{N}(j)$ of all edges $\{i, j\} \in \mathcal{E}$ in the data graph \mathcal{G} . In particular, the execution of Algorithm 2 does not require to collect global knowledge about the entire data graph (e.g., the maximum strength d_{\max} (3)) at some central processing unit. Indeed, if we associate each node in the data graph with a computational unit, the execution of Algorithm 2 requires each node $i \in \mathcal{V}$ only to store the values $\{\hat{y}[\{i, j\}], W_{i,j}\}_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)}$ and $\hat{x}^{(k)}[i]$. This characteristic allows Algorithm 2 to scale well for massive datasets (big data).

Algorithm 1 Sparse Label Propagation

Input: oriented data graph $\vec{\mathcal{G}}$ with incidence matrix $\mathbf{D} \in \mathbb{R}^{\vec{\mathcal{E}} \times \mathcal{V}}$ (cf. (4)), sampling set \mathcal{M} , initial labels $\{x_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{M}}$.
Initialize: $k := 0$, $\mathbf{z}^{(0)} := \mathbf{0}$, $\mathbf{x}^{(0)} := \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{M}}$, $\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(0)} := \mathbf{0}$, $\hat{\mathbf{y}}^{(0)} = \mathbf{0}$, $\gamma_i := 1/\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)} W_{i,j}$, $\lambda_{\{i,j\}} = 1/(2W_{i,j})$.
1: **repeat**
2: $\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(k+1)} := \hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(k)} - \mathbf{\Gamma} \mathbf{D}^T \hat{\mathbf{y}}^{(k)}$ with $\mathbf{\Gamma} = \text{diag}\{\gamma_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{V}}$
3: $\hat{x}^{(k+1)}[i] := x_i$ for all sampled nodes $i \in \mathcal{M}$
4: $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} := 2\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(k+1)} - \hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(k)}$
5: $\hat{\mathbf{y}}^{(k+1)} := \hat{\mathbf{y}}^{(k)} + \mathbf{\Lambda} \mathbf{D} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ with $\mathbf{\Lambda} = \text{diag}\{\lambda_{\{i,j\}}\}_{\{i,j\} \in \mathcal{E}}$
6: $y^{(k+1)}[e] := y[e]/\max\{1, |y[e]|\}$ for all edges $e \in \vec{\mathcal{E}}$
7: $k := k + 1$
8: **until** stopping criterion is satisfied
Output: labels $\hat{x}_{\text{SLP}}[i] := \hat{x}^{(k)}[i]$ for all $i \in \mathcal{V}$

Algorithm 2 Sparse Label Propagation as Message Passing

Input: oriented data graph $\vec{\mathcal{G}} = (\mathcal{V}, \vec{\mathcal{E}}, \mathbf{W})$, sampling set \mathcal{M} , initial labels $\{x_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{M}}$.
Initialize: $k := 0$, $\mathbf{z}^{(0)} := \mathbf{0}$, $\mathbf{x}^{(0)} := \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{M}}$, $\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(0)} := \mathbf{0}$, $\hat{\mathbf{y}}^{(0)} = \mathbf{0}$, $\gamma_i := 1/\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)} W_{i,j}$, $\lambda_{\{i,j\}} = 1/(2W_{i,j})$.
1: **repeat**
2: for all nodes $i \in \mathcal{V}$: $\tilde{x}^{(k+1)}[i] := \tilde{x}^{(k)}[i] - \gamma_i \left[\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_+(i)} W_{i,j} \hat{y}^{(k)}[\{i, j\}] - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_-(i)} W_{i,j} \hat{y}^{(k)}[\{i, j\}] \right]$
3: for all nodes $i \in \mathcal{M}$: $\hat{x}^{(k+1)}[i] := x_i$
4: for all nodes $i \in \mathcal{V}$: $\tilde{x}[i] := 2\hat{x}^{(k+1)}[i] - \hat{x}^{(k)}[i]$
5: for all edges $e \in \vec{\mathcal{E}}$: $\hat{y}^{(k+1)}[e] := \hat{y}^{(k)}[e] + \lambda_{\{i,j\}}(\tilde{x}[e^+] - \tilde{x}[e^-])$
6: for all edges $e \in \vec{\mathcal{E}}$: $\hat{y}^{(k+1)}[e] := \hat{y}^{(k+1)}[e]/\max\{1, |\hat{y}^{(k+1)}[e]|\}$
7: $k := k + 1$
8: **until** stopping criterion is satisfied
Output: labels $\hat{x}_{\text{SLP}}[i] := \hat{x}^{(k)}[i]$ for all $i \in \mathcal{V}$

4. When is SLP Accurate?

In the previous section, we reduced the learning of labels $x[i]$ for all data points z_i based on the data graph and knowledge of a few initial labels x_i , provided for $i \in \mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{V}$, to a convex optimization problem (10). Applying an efficient primal-dual method (Chambolle and Pock,




Figure 2: Data graph \mathcal{G} composed of two clusters $\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2$. Initial labels $\{x_m, x_n\}$ are provided for data points in the sampling set $\mathcal{M} = \{m, n\}$.

2011) to (10) resulted in the SLP Algorithm 1 and its message passing implementation Algorithm 2.

For SLP methods, based on solving (10), to be accurate, i.e., to deliver labels $\hat{x}^{(k)}[i] \approx x[i]$ after a sufficient number k of iterations, the solutions $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ to (10) have to be close to the true labels $x[i]$. In particular, for a true underlying clustered labeling \mathbf{x} of the form (6), we will present a condition which guarantees any solution $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ to (10) is close to \mathbf{x} . To this end, we first introduce the following definition.

Definition 1 Consider a partition $\mathcal{F} = \{\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2, \dots, \mathcal{C}_{|\mathcal{F}|}\}$ of the data graph \mathcal{G} into pairwise disjoint subsets of nodes (clusters) $\mathcal{C}_l \subseteq \mathcal{V}$. We are provided with initial labels for all data points in the sampling set $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{V}$. We say that the partition \mathcal{F} is resolved by a sampling set \mathcal{M} if for each boundary edge $\{i, j\} \in \partial \mathcal{F}$, we can find two sampled nodes $m, n \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $W_{m,i} \geq 2W_{i,j}$ and $W_{n,j} \geq 2W_{i,j}$.

The sampled nodes $m, n \in \mathcal{M}$ considered in Definition 1 necessarily have to be connected to i and j , i.e., $\{i, m\} \in \mathcal{E}$ and $\{n, j\} \in \mathcal{E}$, since $W_{m,i} \geq 2W_{i,j} > 0$ (cf. (1)) and, similarly, $W_{n,j} > 0$. It is important to note that Definition 1 involves both the sampling set \mathcal{M} and the partition \mathcal{F} . In Fig. 2, we depict a sampling set $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{V}$ which resolves the partition \mathcal{F} .

Theorem 2 Consider dataset \mathcal{D} with data graph \mathcal{G} whose nodes represent data points with associated labels $x[i]$. The labels form a clustered graph signal $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{V}}$ according to (6) with a fixed partition $\mathcal{F} = \{\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_{|\mathcal{F}|}\}$. Assume that we are provided the true labels x_i on the sampling set \mathcal{M} . If the sampling set \mathcal{M} resolves the partition \mathcal{F} , the solution $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ to (10) is unique and coincides with the true labels, i.e., $\hat{x}[i] = x[i]$ for all $i \in \mathcal{V}$.

By Theorem 2, learning algorithms based on solving (10), such as Algorithm 1, can be expected to accurately learn true underlying labels $x[i]$ if they amount to a clustered labeling $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{V}}$ of the form (6). We again highlight the fact that Algorithm 1 does not require knowledge of the partition $\mathcal{F} = \{\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_{|\mathcal{F}|}\}$. Indeed, we could use Algorithm 1

for determining the clusters \mathcal{C}_l if the underlying labels $x[i]$ form a clustered graph signal $x[i] = \sum_{l=1}^{|\mathcal{F}|} a_l \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{C}_l}[i]$ with $a_l \neq a_{l'}$ for different clusters $l \neq l'$.

The scope of Theorem 2 is somewhat limited as it applies only to clustered graph signals of the form (6). We now state a more general result which applies to any graph signal $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{V}}$.

Theorem 3 *Consider a dataset represented by a data graph \mathcal{G} and true labels $x[i]$ forming a graph signal $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{V}}$. We are provided with initial labels $x_i = x[i]$ at nodes in the sampling set \mathcal{M} . If the sampling set \mathcal{M} resolves $\mathcal{F} = \{\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_{|\mathcal{F}|}\}$, any solution $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ to (10) satisfies*

$$\|\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}\|_{\text{TV}} \leq 6 \min_{\{a_l\}_{l=1}^{|\mathcal{F}|}} \left\| \mathbf{x} - \sum_{l=1}^{|\mathcal{F}|} a_l \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{C}_l}[\cdot] \right\|_{\text{TV}}. \quad (26)$$

Thus, as long as the true underlying labeling $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{V}}$ can be well approximated by a clustered graph signal of the form (6), with suitable coefficients a_l , any solution $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ to (10) is close (measured in TV semi-norm) to the true underlying labeling \mathbf{x} .

5. Numerical Experiments

In order to assess the empirical performance of SLP Algorithm 1 and its message passing formulation Algorithm 2, we carried out some illustrative numerical experiments involving both real-world and synthetic datasets. For these experiments, we implemented the message passing formulation Algorithm 2 using the graph computation system GRAPHX (Xin et al.), which, in turn, is a higher level abstraction for the the general purpose big data framework SPARK (Zaharia et al.). The programming model of GRAPHX is based on a master/slave architecture which in our experiments consisted of up to 16 identical worker nodes and one master node. Each of those master and worker nodes is equipped with a 64 bit CPU, 8 GB of RAM, 8 GB of disk space with two SPARK partitions.

5.1 Chain graph

The first experiment revolves around a synthetic dataset whose data graph $\mathcal{G}_1 = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, \mathbf{W})$ is a chain (cf. Fig. 1-(a)). In particular, the graph \mathcal{G}_1 contains a total of $N = 10^6$ nodes $\mathcal{V} = \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ which are connected by $N - 1$ undirected edges $\mathcal{E} = \{\{i, i + 1\}\}_{i=1, \dots, N-1}$. The nodes of \mathcal{G}_1 are partitioned into $N/5$ disjoint clusters $\mathcal{F} = \{\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_{N/5}\}$, each of which is constituted by 5 consecutive nodes, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{C}_1 = \{1, \dots, 5\}, \mathcal{C}_2 = \{6, \dots, 10\}, \dots, \mathcal{C}_{N/5} = \{N - 4, \dots, N\}. \quad (27)$$

The weights $W_{i,j}$ for the edges $\{i, j\} \in \mathcal{E}$ are chosen according to the partitioning as

$$W_{i,j} = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } i, j \in \mathcal{C}_l \text{ for some } l \in \{1, \dots, N/5\} \\ 1 & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Given the data graph \mathcal{G}_1 , we generated labels $x[i]$ forming a clustered graph signal of the form (6) with clusters given by (27) and alternating coefficients $a_l \in \{1, 5\}$, i.e.,

$a_1 = 1, a_2 = 5, a_3 = 1$ and so on. The labels $x[i]$ should then be learned solely based on the knowledge of their precise values on the sampling set \mathcal{M} which contains exactly one node from each cluster \mathcal{C}_l . The size of the sampling set is therefore $|\mathcal{M}| = N/5$, i.e., it amounts to 20% of the entire data graph \mathcal{G}_1 .

The learning accuracy achieved by k iterations of SLP Algorithm 2 and ordinary LP (Zhu and Ghahramani, 2002) (based on (11)) is measured by the normalized MSE (NMSE) $\varepsilon := \|\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{(k)}\|_2^2 / \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{(k)}\|_2^2$. We run both methods for a fixed number of 200 iterations and using the same sampling set \mathcal{M} and initial labels $x_i = \tilde{x}[i]$ for $i \in \mathcal{M}$.

In Figure 3, we depict the true labels $\tilde{x}[i]$ as well as the labels delivered by SLP and LP, denoted $\hat{x}_{\text{SLP}}[i]$ and $\hat{x}_{\text{LP}}[i]$, respectively. We observe that ordinary LP tends to smooth out the true labels $\tilde{x}[i]$ by pushing the learned labels $\hat{x}_{\text{LP}}[i]$ for $i \notin \mathcal{M}$ towards the weighted average of neighbours labels. In contrast, the labels $\hat{x}_{\text{SLP}}[i]$ learned by SLP accurately resemble the true labels $\tilde{x}[i]$. The NMSE achieved (after 200 iterations) by SLP is $\varepsilon_{\text{SLP}} = 4.3 \cdot 10^{-3}$ while ordinary LP incurs an NMSE of ε_{LP} of $102.5 \cdot 10^{-3}$. We also depict the evolution of the NMSE ε_{SLP} and ε_{LP} as a function of iteration number k is depicted in Figure 4.




Figure 3: True labels $x[i]$ and labels learned by SLP and LP applied to the data graph \mathcal{G}_1 .

5.2 LFR graph

For our second experiment we generate a data graph $\mathcal{G}_2 = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, \mathbf{W})$ using the Lancichinetti-Fortunato-Radicchi (LFR) model, which is popular for benchmarking of network algorithms (Lancichinetti et al., 2008). The LFR model aims at mimicking the properties of real world networks (e.g., the internet or social networks (Newman, 2010)). In particular, those networks have a power law degree-distribution and exhibit a grouping of nodes into communities or clusters which are only weakly connected mutually.




Figure 4: Dependency of NMSE achieved by SLP and LP on number of iterations, when applied to the data graph \mathcal{G}_1 .

The data graph \mathcal{G}_2 contains $N=30$ nodes $\mathcal{V} = \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ which are partitioned into four clusters $\mathcal{F} = \{\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2, \mathcal{C}_3, \mathcal{C}_4\}$. The nodes are labeled according to cluster membership, i.e., $x[i] = 1$ for all $i \in \mathcal{C}_1$, $x[i] = 2$ for all $i \in \mathcal{C}_2$ and so on. Thus, the labels induce a clustered graph signal of the form (6). The graph nodes are connected by $|\mathcal{E}| = 156$ undirected edges with weights $W_{i,j} \in [1, 2]$ for all $\{i, j\} \in \mathcal{E}$. In Figure 5, we depict the data graph \mathcal{G}_2 along with the label values $x[i]$.




Figure 5: The data graph \mathcal{G}_2 conforming to the LFR model. We also indicated the labels $x[i]$ associated with nodes representing data points.

We then selected randomly 9 nodes of \mathcal{G}_2 as the sampling set for which the labels $x[i]$ are provided to SLP Algorithm 2 and ordinary LP, which both are run for a fixed number

of 100 iterations. The learned labels delivered by SLP and LP, along with the true labels $x[i]$ are shown In Figure 6. Obviously the labels $\hat{x}_{\text{SLP}}[i]$ delivered by SLP are significantly more close to the true labels $x[i]$, compared to those $\hat{x}_{\text{LP}}[i]$ delivered by ordinary LP. The corresponding NMSE values are $\varepsilon_{\text{SLP}} = 1.3 \cdot 10^{-3}$ and $\varepsilon_{\text{LP}} = 12.2 \cdot 10^{-3}$, respectively. The convergence of ε_{SLP} and ε_{LP} is depicted in Figure 7.




Figure 6: True labels $x[i]$, SLP output $\hat{x}_{\text{SLP}}[i]$ and LP output $\hat{x}_{\text{LP}}[i]$ for data graph \mathcal{G}_2 .




Figure 7: Convergence (of NMSE) of SLP and LP applied to data graph \mathcal{G}_2 .

5.3 Foreground-Background Segmentation

Our third experiment considers the problem of segmenting 2D images into foreground and background (Rother et al., 2004). In Figure 8 we show two RGB images (taken from the "grabCut" dataset (Rother et al., 2004)) which are partitioned or segmented into three




Figure 8: Two images from the “grabcut” dataset which are segmented into three regions: background \mathcal{R}_1 , “unknown” \mathcal{R}_2 and foreground \mathcal{R}_3 . The boundaries between the regions are indicated by white stripes.

disjoint regions: background \mathcal{R}_3 , foreground \mathcal{R}_1 and “unknown” \mathcal{R}_2 . The goal is to correctly assign the pixels in \mathcal{R}_2 to foreground or background.

In order to apply SLP to this segmentation problem, we represent each image in Figure 8 by a data graph \mathcal{G}_3 having a grid structure (cf. Figure 1). In particular, the nodes of the data graph \mathcal{G}_3 represent individual image pixels and each node is connected to up to four nodes representing the left, right, top and bottom neighbouring pixel. The weight $W_{i,j}$ of an edge $\{i,j\} \in \mathcal{E}$ is set according to $W_{i,j} := \exp\left(- (1/\sigma)\|\mathbf{v}[i] - \mathbf{v}[j]\|_2^2\right)$ with $\sigma := \text{median}\{\|\mathbf{v}[i] - \mathbf{v}[j]\|_2\}_{\{i,j\} \in \mathcal{E}}$. Here, the vector $\mathbf{v}[i] = (\text{red}[i], \text{green}[i], \text{blue}[i])^T \in \{0, 1, \dots, 255\}^3$ represented the RGB code for the image pixel represented by node $i \in \mathcal{V}$.

The sampling set used for SLP is $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{R}_1 \cup \mathcal{R}_3$, where (with slight abuse of notation) we denote by \mathcal{R}_1 and \mathcal{R}_3 the nodes in the data graph \mathcal{G}_3 which represent foreground and background pixels, respectively. As initial labels, we use $x[i] = 1$ for the background pixels $i \in \mathcal{R}_1$ and $x[i] = -1$ for all foreground pixels $i \in \mathcal{R}_3$. We ran SLP Algorithm 2 for a fixed number of 500 iterations. The signs of the learned labels $\hat{x}_{\text{SLP}}[i]$ for $i \in \mathcal{R}_2$ are then used to determine if the pixel $i \in \mathcal{R}_2$ belongs to foreground (when $\hat{x}_{\text{SLP}}[i] > 0$) or background (when $\hat{x}_{\text{SLP}}[i] \leq 0$). The foreground extracted this way for the images in Figure 8 are depicted in Figure 9.

6. Conclusions

We have considered the problem of transductive semi-supervised learning from massive network structured datasets, i.e., big data over networks. The learning is based on a smoothness assumption, requiring data points within well-connected subsets (clusters) have similar labels. Representing the labels as a graph signal, we translate this informal smoothness hypothesis into a precise graph signal model constituted by clustered graph signals having a small total variation. The resulting learning problem lends then naturally to a (non-




Figure 9: Foregrounds extracted from the images in Figure 8 using SLP Algorithm 2.

mooth) convex optimization problem. By applying an efficient primal-dual method to this optimization problem, we obtained a sparse variant of LP which learns the labels of all data points from a limited amount of initial label information. We derived a highly scalable implementation of SLP in the form of message passing executed over the underlying data graph. Using tools from compressed sensing, we obtained a simple sufficient condition on the data graph structure and the set of initially labeled data points which ensures SLP to be accurate. This condition, roughly speaking, requires to have more initial labels available in the proximity of the cluster boundaries. We have also verified the scalability and empirical performance of SLP by means of numerical experiments implemented on a big data framework.

Acknowledgments

We would like to acknowledge support for this project from the Vienna Science Fund (WWTF) Grant ICT15-119 and US ARO grant W911NF-15-1-0479.

Appendix - Proof of Main Results

We begin with a high-level outline of the proofs for Theorem 2 and Theorem 3: The optimization problem (10) is very similar to the “analysis ℓ_1 -minimization” used for recovery within the cospase analysis model of compressed sensing (Nam et al., 2013). A sufficient condition for analysis ℓ_1 -minimization to deliver the correct solution, i.e., the true underlying graph signal \mathbf{x} , is the analysis nullspace property (Nam et al., 2013; Kabanava and Rauhut, 2015b). Our approach is then to verify this property for graph signals of the form (6) and a sampling set \mathcal{M} which resolves the partition \mathcal{F} used in (6) (cf. Definition 1).

As an intermediate step towards proving our main results Theorem 2 and 3, we now reformulate the analysis nullspace property (Nam et al., 2013; Kabanava and Rauhut, 2015b) in graph signal terminology.

Definition 4 Consider a graph \mathcal{G} containing the sampling set $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{V}$. Let us define the kernel of the sampling set \mathcal{M} as

$$\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{M}) := \{\tilde{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{V}} : \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathcal{M}} = \mathbf{0}\}. \quad (28)$$

The sampling set \mathcal{M} is said to satisfy the network nullspace property (NNSP- \mathcal{S}) w.r.t. an edge set $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{E}$ if

$$\|(\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u})_{\mathcal{E} \setminus \mathcal{S}}\|_1 \geq 2\|(\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u})_{\mathcal{S}}\|_1 \text{ for any } \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{M}) \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}. \quad (29)$$

Utilizing the network nullspace property, the following lemma characterizes when the learning problem (10) defines an accurate estimate for a graph signal with a small edge support $\text{supp}(\mathbf{D}\mathbf{x})$.

Lemma 5 Consider a graph signal $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{V}}$ with edge support $\mathcal{S}_x = \text{supp}(\mathbf{D}\mathbf{x})$ which is observed only at the nodes in the sampling set $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{V}$. If NNSP- \mathcal{S}_x holds, the solution of (10) is unique and coincides with \mathbf{x} .

Proof Let us consider a graph signal $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{V}}$ defined over \mathcal{G} and observed over sampling set \mathcal{M} such that condition (29) is satisfied. Assume there exists another graph signal $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ ($\neq \mathbf{x}$) being feasible for (10), i.e. $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathcal{M}} = \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{M}}$, such that the difference $\mathbf{u} := \hat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}$ belongs to the kernel $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{M})$ (cf. (28)). Note that, since $(\mathbf{D}\mathbf{x})_{\mathcal{S}_x} = \mathbf{D}\mathbf{x}$,

$$(\mathbf{D}\hat{\mathbf{x}})_{\mathcal{E} \setminus \mathcal{S}_x} = (\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u})_{\mathcal{E} \setminus \mathcal{S}_x} \quad (30)$$

Moreover, by the triangle inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\mathbf{D}\hat{\mathbf{x}})_{\mathcal{S}_x}\|_1 &\geq \|(\mathbf{D}\mathbf{x})_{\mathcal{S}_x}\|_1 - \|(\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u})_{\mathcal{S}_x}\|_1 \\ &= \|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{x}\|_1 - \|(\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u})_{\mathcal{S}_x}\|_1. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

However, since $\|\mathbf{D}\hat{\mathbf{x}}\|_1 = \|(\mathbf{D}\hat{\mathbf{x}})_{\mathcal{S}_x}\|_1 + \|(\mathbf{D}\hat{\mathbf{x}})_{\mathcal{E} \setminus \mathcal{S}_x}\|_1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{D}\hat{\mathbf{x}}\|_1 &= \|(\mathbf{D}\hat{\mathbf{x}})_{\mathcal{S}_x}\|_1 + \|(\mathbf{D}\hat{\mathbf{x}})_{\mathcal{E} \setminus \mathcal{S}_x}\|_1 \\ &\stackrel{(30)}{=} \|(\mathbf{D}\hat{\mathbf{x}})_{\mathcal{S}_x}\|_1 + \|(\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u})_{\mathcal{E} \setminus \mathcal{S}_x}\|_1 \\ &\stackrel{(31)}{\geq} \|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{x}\|_1 - \|(\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u})_{\mathcal{S}_x}\|_1 + \|(\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u})_{\mathcal{E} \setminus \mathcal{S}_x}\|_1 \\ &\stackrel{(29)}{>} \|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{x}\|_1. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

■
We will also need another more practical result which applies to graph signals $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{V}}$ whose associated edge signal $\mathbf{D}\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{E}}$ is not strictly sparse but which is well concentrated on a small subset $\mathcal{S}' \subseteq \mathcal{E}$ of edges.

Lemma 6 Consider a graph signal $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{V}}$ which is observed at the nodes in the sampling set $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{V}$. If the condition NNSP- \mathcal{S}' is valid for the edge set $\mathcal{S}' \subseteq \mathcal{E}$, then any solution $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ of (10) satisfies

$$\|\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{x} - \hat{\mathbf{x}})\|_1 \leq 6\|(\mathbf{D}\mathbf{x})_{\mathcal{E} \setminus \mathcal{S}'}\|_1. \quad (33)$$

Proof The argument closely follows that in the proof of (Kabanava and Rauhut, 2015a, Theorem 8). First, observe that for any solution $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ of (10), we have

$$\|\mathbf{D}\hat{\mathbf{x}}\|_1 \leq \|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{x}\|_1, \quad (34)$$

since \mathbf{x} is trivially feasible for (10). From (34), we obtain further

$$\|(\mathbf{D}\hat{\mathbf{x}})_{\mathcal{S}'}\|_1 + \|(\mathbf{D}\hat{\mathbf{x}})_{\mathcal{E}\setminus\mathcal{S}'}\|_1 \leq \|(\mathbf{D}\mathbf{x})_{\mathcal{S}'}\|_1 + \|(\mathbf{D}\mathbf{x})_{\mathcal{E}\setminus\mathcal{S}'}\|_1. \quad (35)$$

Since $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ is feasible for (10), i.e., $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathcal{M}} = \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{M}}$, the difference signal $\mathbf{v} := \hat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}$ belongs to the kernel $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{M})$ (cf. (28)). Applying triangle inequality to (35),

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(\mathbf{D}\mathbf{x})_{\mathcal{S}'}\|_1 - \|(\mathbf{D}\mathbf{v})_{\mathcal{S}'}\|_1 - \|(\mathbf{D}\mathbf{x})_{\mathcal{E}\setminus\mathcal{S}'}\|_1 + \|(\mathbf{D}\mathbf{v})_{\mathcal{E}\setminus\mathcal{S}'}\|_1 \leq \\ & \|(\mathbf{D}\mathbf{x})_{\mathcal{S}'}\|_1 + \|(\mathbf{D}\mathbf{x})_{\mathcal{E}\setminus\mathcal{S}'}\|_1, \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

and, in turn,

$$\|(\mathbf{D}\mathbf{v})_{\mathcal{E}\setminus\mathcal{S}'}\|_1 \leq \|(\mathbf{D}\mathbf{v})_{\mathcal{S}'}\|_1 + 2\|(\mathbf{D}\mathbf{x})_{\mathcal{E}\setminus\mathcal{S}'}\|_1. \quad (37)$$

Combining this inequality with (29) (since the network nullspace property is assumed to hold) gets us to

$$\|(\mathbf{D}\mathbf{v})_{\mathcal{E}\setminus\mathcal{S}'}\|_1 \leq (1/2)\|(\mathbf{D}\mathbf{v})_{\mathcal{E}\setminus\mathcal{S}'}\|_1 + 2\|(\mathbf{D}\mathbf{x})_{\mathcal{E}\setminus\mathcal{S}'}\|_1 \quad (38)$$

and, in turn,

$$\|(\mathbf{D}\mathbf{v})_{\mathcal{E}\setminus\mathcal{S}'}\|_1 \leq 4\|(\mathbf{D}\mathbf{x})_{\mathcal{E}\setminus\mathcal{S}'}\|_1. \quad (39)$$

Using the network nullspace property again,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{x} - \hat{\mathbf{x}})\|_1 &= \|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{v}\|_1 \\ &= \|(\mathbf{D}\mathbf{v})_{\mathcal{S}'}\|_1 + \|(\mathbf{D}\mathbf{v})_{\mathcal{E}\setminus\mathcal{S}'}\|_1 \\ &\stackrel{(29)}{\leq} (3/2)\|(\mathbf{D}\mathbf{v})_{\mathcal{E}\setminus\mathcal{S}'}\|_1 \\ &\stackrel{(39)}{\leq} 6\|(\mathbf{D}\mathbf{x})_{\mathcal{E}\setminus\mathcal{S}'}\|_1. \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

■

Let us now render Lemma 5 and Lemma 6 for clustered graph signals $x[i]$ of the form (6) with a particular partition \mathcal{F} of the data graph into the clusters \mathcal{C}_l . In particular, we will give now a sufficient condition on the graph topology, characterized by the clusters $\mathcal{C}_l \in \mathcal{F}$ used in (6), and the sampling set \mathcal{M} such that the network nullspace property (cf. Definition 4) is satisfied for the edge support $\text{supp}(\mathbf{D}\mathbf{x})$ for any clustered graph signal $x[i]$ conforming to (6).

Lemma 7 *Consider a partition $\mathcal{F} = \{\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_{|\mathcal{F}|}\}$ of node subsets (clusters) \mathcal{C}_l , which is resolved (cf. Definition 1) by the sampling set \mathcal{M} . Then, the condition NNSP- \mathcal{S} is satisfied for the boundary $\mathcal{S} = \partial\mathcal{F}$.*

Proof According to Definition 1, for any boundary edge $e = \{i, j\} \in \mathcal{S}$, we can find two nodes $m \in \mathcal{C}_a \cap \mathcal{M}$ and $n \in \mathcal{C}_b \cap \mathcal{M}$ such that

$$\{m, i\}, \{n, j\} \in \mathcal{E}, \text{ with } W_{m,i} \geq 2W_{i,j}, \text{ and } W_{n,j} \geq 2W_{i,j}. \quad (41)$$

Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{M})$ be an arbitrary graph signal which vanishes on the sampling set \mathcal{M} , i.e.,

$$\mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{M}} = \mathbf{0}. \quad (42)$$

This graph signal induces an edge signal $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}$. We now verify $\|\mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{E} \setminus \mathcal{S}}\|_1 \geq 2\|\mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}}\|_1$. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}}\|_1 &= \sum_{e=\{i,j\} \in \mathcal{S}} W_{i,j} |u[i] - u[j]| \\ &\stackrel{u[m]=u[n]=0}{=} \sum_{e=\{i,j\} \in \mathcal{S}} W_{i,j} |u[i] - u[j] - u[m] + u[n]| \\ &\leq \sum_{e=\{i,j\} \in \mathcal{S}} W_{i,j} |u[i] - u[m]| + W_{i,j} |u[n] - u[j]| \\ &\stackrel{(41)}{\leq} \sum_{e=\{i,j\} \in \mathcal{S}} (1/2)W_{m,i} |u[i] - u[m]| + (1/2)W_{n,j} |u[j] - u[n]| \\ &\leq (1/2)\|\mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{E} \setminus \mathcal{S}}\|_1. \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

■

We can then verify Theorem 2 by combining Definition 1 with Lemma 7 and Lemma 5. Similarly, we verify Theorem 3 by combining Definition 1 with Lemma 7 and Lemma 6.

References

- S. Becker, J. Bobin, and E. J. Candès. NESTA: a fast and accurate first-order method for sparse recovery. *SIAM Journal on Imaging Sciences*, 4(1):1–39, 2011.
- C. M. Bishop. *Pattern Recognition and Machine Learning*. 2006.
- S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe. *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, UK, 2004.
- A. Chambolle. An algorithm for total variation minimization and applications. *Journal of Mathematical imaging and vision*, 20(1-2):89–97, 2004.
- A. Chambolle and T. Pock. A first-order primal-dual algorithm for convex problems with applications to imaging. *J. Math. Imaging Vision*, 40(1):120–145, 2011. ISSN 0924-9907. doi: 10.1007/s10851-010-0251-1. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10851-010-0251-1>.
- A. Chambolle and T. Pock. An introduction to continuous optimization for imaging. *Acta Numer.*, 25:161–319, 2016. ISSN 0962-4929. doi: 10.1017/S096249291600009X. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S096249291600009X>.
- O. Chapelle, B. Schölkopf, and A. Zien, editors. *Semi-Supervised Learning*. The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 2006.

- S. Chen, A. Sandryhaila, J. M. F. Moura, and J. Kovacevic. Signal denoising on graphs via graph filtering. In *Proc. IEEE GlobalSIP*, pages 872–876, Dec. 2014.
- S. Chen, A. Sandryhaila, and J. Kovacevic. Sampling theory for graph signals. pages 3392–3396, April 2015a.
- S. Chen, R. Varma, A. Sandryhaila, and J. Kovacevic. Discrete signal processing on graphs: Sampling theory. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 63(24):6510–6523, Dec 2015b. ISSN 1053-587X. doi: 10.1109/TSP.2015.2469645.
- S. Cui, A. Hero, Z.-Q. Luo, and J.M.F. Moura, editors. *Big Data over Networks*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 2016.
- D. L. Donoho. High-dimensional data analysis: The curses and blessings of dimensionality. In *Amer. Math. Soc. Lecture: “Math challenges of the 21st century”*, 2000.
- S. Fortunato. Community detection in graphs. *arXiv*, 2009.
- D. Hallac, J. Leskovec, and S. Boyd. Network lasso: Clustering and optimization in large graphs. In *Proc. SIGKDD*, pages 387–396, 2015.
- A. Juditsky and A. Nemirovski. First-order methods for nonsmooth convex large-scale optimization, I: General purpose methods. In S. Sra, S. Nowozin, and S. Wright, editors, *Optimization for Machine Learning*, pages 121–147. MIT press, 2011.
- A. Jung. Learning the conditional independence structure of stationary time series: A multitask learning approach. *IEEE Trans. Signal Processing*, 63(21), Nov. 2015.
- A. Jung. When is network lasso accurate? *ArXiv*, 2017.
- A. Jung, R. Heckel, H. Bölcskei, and F. Hlawatsch. Compressive nonparametric graphical model selection for time series. In *Proc. IEEE ICASSP-2014*, Florence, Italy, May 2014.
- A. Jung, G. Hannak, and N. Görtz. Graphical LASSO Based Model Selection for Time Series. *IEEE Sig. Proc. Letters*, 22(10):1781–1785, Oct. 2015.
- M. Kabanava and H. Rauhut. Analysis ℓ_1 -recovery with frames and gaussian measurements. (1):173 – 195, Dec. 2015a.
- M. Kabanava and H. Rauhut. Cosparsity in compressed sensing. In H. Boche, R. Calderbank, G. Kutyniok, and J. Vybiral, editors, *Compressed Sensing and Its Applications*, pages 315–339. Springer, 2015b.
- A. Lancichinetti, S. Fortunato, and F. Radicchi. Benchmark graphs for testing community detection algorithms. *Phys. Rev. E*, 78:046110, Oct 2008. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevE.78.046110. URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevE.78.046110>.
- J. Mayika, B. Brown, J. Bughin, R. Dobbs, C. Roxburgh, and A. H. Byers. Big data: The next frontier for innovation, competition, and productivity. *McKinsey Global Institute*, May 2011.

- M. Moldaschl, W. N. Gansterer, O. Hlinka, F. Meyer, and F. Hlawatsch. Distributed decorrelation in sensor networks with application to distributed particle filtering. pages 6117–6121, May 2014.
- E. Mossel, J. Neeman, and A. Sly. Stochastic block models and reconstruction. *ArXiv e-prints*, Feb. 2012.
- S. Nam, M.E. Davies, M. Elad, and R. Gribonval. The cosparse analysis model and algorithms. *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 34(1):30–56, Jan. 2013.
- M. E. J. Newman. *Networks: An Introduction*. Oxford Univ. Press, 2010.
- N. Parikh and S. Boyd. Proximal algorithms. *Foundations and Trends in Optimization*, 1(3):123–231, 2013.
- T. Pock and A. Chambolle. Diagonal preconditioning for first order primal-dual algorithms in convex optimization. In *IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2011.
- Z. Quan, W. J. Kaiser, and A. H. Sayed. Innovations diffusion: A spatial sampling scheme for distributed estimation and detection. *IEEE Trans. Signal Processing*, 57(2):738–751, Feb. 2009.
- R. T. Rockafellar. *Convex Analysis*. Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, NJ, 1970.
- Carsten Rother, Vladimir Kolmogorov, and Andrew Blake. "grabcut": Interactive foreground extraction using iterated graph cuts. *ACM Trans. Graph.*, 23(3):309–314, Aug. 2004. ISSN 0730-0301. doi: 10.1145/1015706.1015720. URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1015706.1015720>.
- J. Sharpnack, A. Rinaldo, and A. Singh. Sparsistency of the edge lasso over graphs. *AISTATS (JMLR WCP)*, 2012.
- D. I. Shuman, S. K. Narang, P. Frossard, A. Ortega, and P. Vandergheynst. The emerging field of signal processing on graphs: Extending high-dimensional data analysis to networks and other irregular domains. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 30(3):83–98, May 2013.
- Y.-X. Wang, J. Sharpnack, A. J. Smola, and R. J. Tibshirani. Trend filtering on graphs. *J. Mach. Lear. Research*, 17, 2016.
- T. White. *Hadoop: The Definitive Guide*. O'Reilly, 2009.
- A. Wiesel and A. O. Hero. Distributed covariance estimation in Gaussian graphical models. *IEEE Trans. Signal Processing*, 60(1):211 – 220, Jan. 2012.
- R. S. Xin, J. E. Gonzalez, M. J. Franklin, and I. Stoica. Graphx: A resilient distributed graph system on spark. In *First International Workshop on Graph Data Management Experiences and Systems*. ACM.
- M. Zaharia, M. Chowdhury, M. J. Franklin, S. Shenker, and I. Stoica. Spark: cluster computing with working sets. 10:10–10.

X. Zhu and Z. Ghahramani. Learning from labeled and unlabeled data with label propagation. Technical report, 2002.